The book provides very little information about the academic background of the author except that “he is a research professor at the International Noble Academy in Toronto”, and that “he is also the editor in chief of the Indian Journal of Asian Affairs.”

Introducing the book, the publisher observes “it examines India as a rising global power by re-evaluating its foreign policy and relations from the Nehru’s period to the present through an analytical framework constructed from Indian foreign policy and the process of globalization and regionalization.” Global Power describes the economic, scientific, technological and nuclear gains that have been made by India reaffirming its status as a major actor on the International scene.” It adds, “The book presents a fundamental reappraisal of the ever-changing relationship between India and other major and regional powers, paying special attention to its relationship with China and Pakistan.” (Back Page).

The publishers also gathered some managed opinions on the book, particularly of James Patrick, Director Centre for International Studies University of Southern California and a distinguished scholar in Foreign Policy Analysis 2006-2007, International Study Association. James
suggests that this work is “the unevenly structured nature of globalisation as a backdrop for foreign policy analysis.” Earlier James suggested “This book begins with a thoughtful review of concept formation with regard to globalization”, drawing attention to “its neglected effects and shortcomings.” The other opinion borrowed is from an Indian, Summit Ganguly of Robindra Nath Tagore Chair in Indian Cultures and Civilization at Indiana University, Bloomington.

Indian ambitions to be recognised as a global power for a last couple of decades and achieving also a permanent seat in the Security Council, has not yet been recognized by international community except stray support by some stake holders in India. England and U.S.A., despite close relations with India, have not yet committed their support, and so do other permanent members of the Security Council. India does not have the support of the countries of South Asian Region including Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.

This review aims to project and analyses briefly B.M. Jain’s view on the changing trends in Indian Foreign Policy since Nehru’s era and their impact on India’s growing ambitions for International recognition as a global power.

The book divided over ten chapters containing definition of Globalisation and Regionalization in International relationship (Chapter 1), Indian Foreign Policy: An Overview (Chapter 2), India’s Economic Diplomacy (Chapter 3), India – U.S. Relations (Chapter 4), India–Russia Relationship (Chapter 5), India China Relationship (Chapter 6), India–Pakistan Relationship (Chapter 7), India’s Relationship with Middle East and Central Asia (Chapters 8 & 9) and lastly Translating the Global Power Ambition. (Chapter 10).
Introducing globalization and regionalization in international relations B.M. Jain discusses the main ingredients of the two, separately, which suits Indian ambitions for prospective global power. “Globalization means”, he explains, “abolition of geographic barriers or the death of distances.” It means a faster movement of idea, of technique, of culture and of economics among nations and individuals. In this process multinational, transnational NGOs have played key role in articulating the concerns and interests of the world community at large”. (p.3). In supporting his argument, he quotes Fieldsman: “globalization has contributed to the global market place, the rise of global cultures (on homogenous level) that is the spread of Americanisation on global scale”. (p.3). It is here that India is focusing to project her culture on electronic media compatible to occidental fashion without caring for more than 70% of her people who still love oriental values with simple life so common in all the religions in India.

B.M. Jain also discusses the solo power vs. multipower perception of the new world order after the demise of the Soviet Russia. He claims that India is supporter of the multipower world order which is supported also by Russia and China. (.7). “The Unipolar world led by the U.S.A. is supported by its anglo-sexan cousins” (p.7). It does not give due place to sovereignty, equality and equity.” (p.7). India’s foreign policy for the last sixty years or so shows her hegemonic ambitions over smaller states like Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Maldives and later on Bangladesh. Pakistan alone in South Asian countries has stood challenging Indian political dominance notwithstanding her own weak and chaquered career. It may not be an exaggeration to suggest that Pakistan’s position vs. India has remained a source of strength for other smaller countries in the region which is evident from the fact that India has many causes of conflicts and disputes with
smaller states around. On the contrary, Pakistan is friendly with all of them except India.

Refereeing to the failure of regionalization, B. M. Jain laments: “The SAARC has not succeeded in promoting free trade regime at the regional level.” (P.9) Jain makes no mention of the causes of this failure and whether or not India had a key role in it. The reason being that India herself had created such regional disputes which she has no intention to solve. Her hegemonic politics is looked with skepticism by neighbors. As such, free trade under SAARC is limited alone between India and Sri Lanka. It is so amazing that a country which fails to accommodate on just and fair grounds smaller neighbours, how could she aspire leadership of the region and become a global power?

B. M. Jain suggests that Indian foreign policy was being reshaped so that she could solicit world recognition for India as a great power.

Jain introducing the aims and objects of Indian foreign policy observes that it “is to protect and pursue its core national interests – ensuring the comprehensive national security and interest against internal and external threats, fostering the economic development and prosperity and preserving the cultural values and assets.” (p.19). Jain adds “unlike the ethical egoism of the British, India has always attached importance to the inherent virtues of tolerance, self sacrifice and self discipline”. (P.19). there is nothing extraordinary in the aims and objects of Indian foreign policy. These are the undercurrents of foreign policies of any modern country irrespective of her status. But Jain’s claim to Indian attachment of her “inherent virtues of tolerance and self sacrifices” are not compatible to the growing communalism in India since independence despite her claim to secularist culture. Perhaps it is another undercurrent of Indian foreign policy to project her secular
face to the world notwithstanding her inhuman treatment to keep all minorities, particularly Muslims, without civil liberties, and so often a prey to communal assaults and pillage.

Tracing the history of Indian foreign policy after 1947, and eulogizing Nehru’s foresight keeping India away from the cold war after the World War II and as leader of the non allied nations, he kept a balance between the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. and also supporting China in winning a permanent seat in the U.N. Security Council. “And yet,” Jain adds, “China unleashed an unprovoked aggression against India in the winter of 1962”| Jain does not mention that it was India which crossed the international border at NEFA, but accepts, “infact Nehru had intentionally realized that a combined power of the two giants posed a potential threat not only to the world peace but also to India’s security and geographical interests.” (P.22) India’s defeat though eventually cost Nehru’s life (1964) but it flooded India with hardware and military assistance from all over the Western World including Israel, with an offer of nuclear umbrella which is noted by Jain.

He says, “On Nehru’s appeal United States and Britain came with a modest military assistance to bail India out at that critical moment.” (ibid) Jain suggests that in return the U.S.A. and Great Britain mounted pressure on India to solve Kashmir dispute in Pakistan’s favour. (ibid). Refering to Nehru’s foreign policy Jain observes: “The problem enacted from Nehru’s self directed image of the prevailing international system was based upon his own perceptions and prediction. So Indian foreign policy under Nehru was highly personalized.” (23) Jain concedes “After Nehru’s death in May 1964 there was hardly any political leader of his caliber, vision and stature in the Congress party… Shastri was, too, innocent a politician. He fell an easy prey
to chiseled bureaucrat and the diplomatic core in Administration. Shastri had neither a vision for India to grow as world power, nor he had the imagination to give Indian foreign policy a new look. He was unfortunately locked up in tense relationship with Pakistan on Kashmir dispute which the Indian retreat in April 1965 at Ran of Katch made Shastri to declare that “India shall fight Pakistan on the grounds of her choice. This proved soon true when Indian forces crossed international border on 6th September of the same year at Lahore. Jain observes “A major achievement of his (Shastri) government was India’s military victory over Pakistan in the 1965 war.” (23). Nothing could be worst than that; more so when scholars like Jain come to a subjective view like the one of Indian victory. India did win against Pakistan but only in 1971 and that too with machination rather than with military force. In fact Shastri was a misfit in the Indian National Congress.

Indra Gandhi his successor was a shrewd woman, much more than the rest of the congressmen, ever ready to walk in her father’s shoes, particularly in foreign policy, flirting between the two power blocks, molding gradually each one of them to Indian favour. Thus her successes in granting independence to Bangladesh turned her to become the Iron lady of Asia, a title she coveted most. She resisted occasionally the advice of his political councils P.N. Dhar and P.N. Haskar. Her orders for nuclear test (18 May 1974) against all odds made her Indian Durga (The goddess of power). But unfortunately their symbol of Indian strength was assassinated by her own guard in retaliation to her strong policy against the Sikhs, in the Punjab, desecrating the Golden Temple at Amritsar. She was succeeded by her son, young, energetic and a thoughtful person, different in political and strategical culture from her mother.” He did not posses the sharpness of his mother and the political foresight of his maternal grandfather. Yet he had the
ambitions to build India more advanced in scientific and technological know-how which was not possible without close cooperation and friendship with the U.S.A.

Rajev’s relations with the neighbouring countries remained strained. He was skeptical of Pakistan’s involvement in Sikh affairs in the Indian Punjab and he once intended a pre-emptive attack on Azad Kashmir, but then, some saner view prevailed upon him. Indian involvement in Sri Lanka eventually took Rajiv’s life, leaving India to repeatedly falling governments one after another from Narasima Rao (1991-96) Dev Gowda (June 1996 to April 1997), Inder Kumar Gujral (1997-April 1998) to Atal Behari Vajipaee. At times, India seemed to have fallen a prey to destabilization. But the Congress having regained power under United Progressive Alliance (UPA) helped in gaining grounds once again to put India on the track to progress.

Notwithstanding Indian ambitions and a claim to be recognised as a global power, it may be worthwhile to examine her relations with neigh-bouring countries, particularly with China and Pakistan. India, despite her defeat in 1962 at NEFA, and fully realizing her weak position at least in military hardware, war strategy, will and courage, she has never withdrawn from her claim to a leading Asian power. U.S. boost up to India visa vis China since 1962 and also Russian support, did not prove enough. India’s economic built up and high growth rate, though encouraging, yet it created little impact in changing the lot of the forty percent people still living below poverty line including Muslim population, half educated, socially, and politically on the decline. Gopal Sing’s minority report and later Sachar’s report are record of history. Even after the passage of almost a decade of Sachar’s Report, the implementation of these reports is lacking initiative. Jain appreciating the Chinese economic progress concedes:
“China’s pro-active economic diplomacy is better poised to achieve the target set only by the CCP politburo. He quotes Ester Pan (China Soft Power Interactive, May 18 2006, http://www.cfr.org/publication/10715/chinas_soft_power_initiative.html, assessed December 2, 2006), “Persuasion and appeal” has enabled it to reach out to South East Asia, Latin America and Africa not only to develop and sustain in economic partnership with them but also to promote cultural diplomacy”. Esther Pan adds, “China’s much noted economic progress has been accompanied by a steady expansion in its cultural and diplomatic influence globally, especially in the developing world.” (p.69). On the contrary, Indian economy, however progressive in comparison to other developing courtiers like Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, has little match even to countries like Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia. Jain laments, “India is lagging behind China mainly because India is not implementing a simple mantra that there is an inevitable synergy between economic diplomacy and cultural diplomacy which is essential for a rising power in the global cultural economy.” (p.69).

This leads to the conclusion that India is not yet fit to claim as a prospective global power. India’s serious concern against China is ‘Pakistan Factor’, which has persistently marred Sino-Indian relation. Jain observes “India-China relations are likely to be held hostage to the latter in military and nuclear cooperation with Pakistan since their under lying motives is in the geopolitical and geo-strategic containment of India. What is troubling India is not so much the unresolved boundary dispute that had be-deviled their relations, but China’s overt and covert military, nuclear and missile building assistance to Pakistan.” (p.146). Jain concedes that China’s close relations with Pakistan has since obliged India to seek U.S. confirmation particularly in military security and strategic
fields as also in civil nuclear partnership. (p.146). Jain also asserts that China does not support India on Kashmir dispute a cautious policy that she has usually followed on the issue. (p.147).

Jain opins his chapter on India-Pakistan Relations (chapter VII) with his confession on the Two Nation Theory without its mention. He maintains: “Both the countries have failed to transcend the deeply entrenched psychology of mutual hatred and hostility. Both the countries have maintained a perpetual victim of self-delusions as well as of enemy images of each other, mainly because of fundamental differences in their political, economic and cultural outlook, as well as in geo-political perception, goals and interests.” (p.159). Noting the factors contributing to these differences, Jain observes “The prolonged impasse in the New Delhi-Islamabad relationship may be attributed to a host of factors. This is partly rooted in their geopolitical divergences, socio-cultural differences and partly in the pangs of partition of the British India based on the two nation theory.” (p.159). This is exactly what the Muslims of South Asia had been claiming before and after the partition of August 1947, reiterated again and again by Pakistani leaders, celebrating the independence day every following year.

But it must be clearly understood that the Muslims are by nature broad minded. They grudged so long their political rights were denied before 1947. With the achievement of their goal, they became relaxed as usual excepts when India grasped Kashmir, a Muslim majority state, with fraud and seized Junagarh and Manawader by force, when the two states acceded to Pakistan. Muslims of Pakistan may still be happy and may square up all differences with India, provided India accepted a fair and impartial plebiscite in Kashmir under the supervision of the
United Nation. Jain observes: “They (India and Pakistan) have acknowledged the urgency of concentrating on addressing development issues as well as fulfilling aspirations and expectation of their people revealing under abject poverty and hunger rather than spreading scarce resources on nuclear and missile building programmes and arms build up.” (p. 159). True; this is what Pakistan had been crying for the last six decades since independence, and India, avoiding on one pretext or another. She evaded U.N. missions trying to mediate on the issue and all bilateral talks between the two countries failed because India never intended and she still does not want to part away and slice off Kashmir from India at whatever cost. Thousands of Kashmiris have laid their lives, fighting for their freedom; they are still clamoring for international support on their freedom struggle, feeling victims to military and police firing on streets of Srinagar, Baramula and else where, protesting under curfew enforced. The world – the international community is silent, for their economic and political stakes are too big and they cannot take the risk of their loss. The whole chapter is Jain’s apology to India’s conduct and her aspirations to keep Pakistan under pressure for her security with constant interference and disturbances in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Baluchistan and Sind through RAW agents.

Jain’s analysis of the two nation theory in 6 points (p.163) is not incorrect. Pakistanis still believe in it and shall continue to believe in it so long India does not behave better. The largest democracy around the globe must sympathetically consider the birth right of the four million Kashmiris to vote for their future. If India has failed all these sixty years or more to win them over despite T.A.D.A. and ruthless killings, rapes, burnings of houses, markets, and tortures, what hopes she has of future consolation and compromise? Situation in Kashmir may
not change even if India remains there for a hundred years or more. It shall remain a permanent source of trouble for India and a constant threat, besides a hanging nuclear flashpoint.

Indian intellectuals like B.M. Jain and others do realize that India might economically gain more against all that she has invested on Kashmir and may still pawn upon a dead horse (from Indian point of view). Jain rightly points out “…nuclear weapons may be index of power and prestige but they cannot be the substitute of an absolute security”. (p.181) Jain urges: “Changes may be brought about an emotive issues like Kashmir on which India and Pakistan have been interlocked for nearly five decades without any tangible gain.” (p.181). Pakistanis unfortunately is the aggrieved party. She was deprived of Kashmir’s accession through fraud committed by the Government of India in league with the Viceroy and the Maharaja of Kashmir. It is India that can be more generous a democratic state to listen to the people of Kashmir and give them a positive response. Pakistan is no longer an active participant, except that she supports Kashmir’s cause politically and diplomatically at all international forums. The new generation of Kashmiri Muslims is more knowledgeable, more energetic, and more politically oriented. They are aware of the cause of their backwardness as compared to the youths of other parts of Indian states. They have, as such, reasons to groan and protest. India should come forward to look in the interest of this generation and of those to follow so that prosperity and goodwill may come in the region and India may too be relieved of the extra economic and political control she has so long taken over her shoulders. Lastly, it may be quite relevant to suggest that solution of Kashmir dispute may help India achieving her most envious ambition to become a global power.
In his conclusion of this chapter on Indo-Pakistan relation, Jain maintains: “A widely held perception that the Kashmir problem is the root cause of hostility between India and Pakistan is wrong. The Kashmir imbroglio is symptomatic of the deeply rooted historical and cultural differences. Even if Kashmir problem is resolved, India and Pakistan would remain interlocked in mutual hostility unless their old mindset and psycho-cultural prejudices are dissolved because of their security and strategic divergences.” (p.184). No Sir! This is not true. Let India solve the Kashmir issue in accordance to the wishes of the people of Kashmir, you will see how Pakistan supports India in her ambitions to grow as a world power. Remember, greatness of people is not in aggression, capitalizing through servitude and political slavery. It is in the deliverance of human freedom, respect of human values and service to others. What is presently needed is to educate the people of South Asia to rise and revolt against the current norms and political culture. Hegemonic theories are outdated in the scenario of the globalization of world economy. India cannot grow as powerful as the U.S.A. in another hundred year.

The U.S. failures in Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere is a good example for countries which intend to wear U.S. shoes. Jain has included in his appendix India’s Power Profile, Macro economic profile, and Military and Human resources profiles besides her Atomic network. It does suggests India’s potentials but not its effectiveness. It could be more impressive if Jain had noted schemes for the betterment of poor lot in the country, needing food and medicine under just simple living. The world needs a more sympathetic view of the great and developing powers to serve the humanity suffering under different kinds of calamities, both human made and natural.
India is a great country already, not that she is a global power. But she is one of the oldest civilization around the globe, with her most instructive historical sites and cultural relics, Muslims and non-Muslims, spread all over the sub-continent. This is why A. L. Bhasham called it ‘The Wonders That Was India’ (Grove Press London, 1954). Let me correct Bhasham that India is not a wonder of the past. It is the wonder of the Orient world even today.